



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

NORTHERN DIVISION  
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND  
10 INDUSTRIAL HIGHWAY  
MAIL STOP, #82  
LESTER, PA 19113-2090

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
AGENCY RG II

93 MAY -5 AM 2:44

AWM-HAZ WASTE FAC BRANCH

5090  
Ser 1869/1821/JLC

MEMORANDUM

APR 22 1993

FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (TRC) FOR  
INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM AT NAVAL WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL  
RESERVE PLANT (NWIRP) BETHPAGE, NEW YORK

Enclosed is a copy of the minutes of the TRC meeting held on  
March 10, 1993. Please contact Mr. James Colter at (215) 595-  
0567 if you have any questions or comments regarding the minutes.  
Once the minutes are accepted they will be entered into the  
administrative record.

The next TRC meeting is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, August  
10, 1993. The main topic of discussion will be regarding  
comments of the draft RI and FS reports. You will be receiving  
another letter from this office a few weeks prior to the  
scheduled meeting date confirming or rescheduling the meeting.

Sincerely,

THOMAS G. SHECKELS  
Head, Restoration Management Section  
By direction of the Commanding Officer

Distribution:

Bethpage Water District, John Molloy  
DCMDN Boston, Jim McConnell  
DLA/DPRO, Martin Simonson  
Geraghty & Miller, Carlo San Giovanni, Doug Smolensky  
Grumman Aerospace Corporation, John Ohlmann  
Halliburton NUS, David Brayack  
Nassau County Health Department, Laurie Lutzker  
Naval Air Systems Command, Robert Booth  
NYSDEC, John Barnes  
NYSDEC, Henry Wilkie, Kelly Bologna  
NYS Department of Health, Lloyd Wilson, Tim Vickerson  
EPA Region II, Ms. Mary Logan

Copy to:  
CNO OP-45  
COMNAVFACENGCOM, Code 181A

275075



**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING #4**  
→ **MARCH 10, 1993**  
**NWIRP, BETHPAGE NY**

**Introduction**

- 1) Mr. Jim Colter of the Navy introduced himself as the new RPM (Remedial Project Manager) for the NWIRP Bethpage.

**Comments on Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting #3 Minutes**

- 1) The Navy asked if there were any comments on the minutes from the third TRC meeting. There were none - these minutes were accepted as final.

**Navy/EPA - Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA)**

- 1) Ms. Mary Logan of the EPA (Superfund) was introduced to discuss the progress of the FFA.
- 2) The EPA commented that the Bethpage Facility will likely be listed on the NPL and that the FFA should help in the transition from RCRA to CERCLA. The FFA is currently circulating internally at the EPA.
- 3) NYSDEC asked if separate agreements were being considered for the Calverton and the Bethpage facilities. The EPA indicated that separate agreements were being prepared, but that there will be a significant amount of common language.

**Status Update of Phase 2 RI/FS**

- 1) The Navy asked if there were any questions on the Status Report through January 1993 (distributed with the TRC meeting invitation). There were none.
- 2) The Navy distributed and discussed an updated schedule. This updated schedule indicates a delay of approximately five weeks from that presented in the work plan. The delay results primarily because of the delayed start of drilling activities.
- 3) The Navy indicated that they may consider proceeding with remediation under an accelerated program. Remedial design may start as early as this fall (and prior to completion of the ROD). The NYSDEC indicates that there may be some risks with this approach. The Navy understands that there may be risks and the Navy would not proceed unless there is good indication of community acceptance.
- 4) The New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) questioned the implied elimination of Plant No. 3 as a potential source of contamination. Halliburton NUS (HNUS) indicated that Plant No. 3 is still being considered as a potential source and that a soil gas program is now planned for Plant No. 3. This topic will be discussed shortly.

**Phase 2 RI/FS Field Activities**

- 1) HNUS provided a brief update of the field activities (see the TRC agenda for details).

- 2) The Bethpage Water District representative (BWD) asked if analytical data could be provided prior to submittal of the Draft RI report.
- 3) The Navy/HNUS agreed that the data could be provided shortly after data validation is complete. These results will be available approximately two months after sample collection.
- 4) NYSDEC indicated that split samples of the groundwater will be collected on this Monday (March 15, 1993) and Tuesday (March 16, 1993) and that these results will be provided to the Navy. BWD requested this information as well. NYSDEC agreed.
- 5) Halliburton NUS provided a brief discussion of the planned soil gas program for Plant No. 3. A draft Work Plan/Health & Safety addendum was distributed. It was explained that the basis for this program is the finding of elevated HNu results from an intermediate monitoring well installed between HN-24I and Plant No. 3.
- 6) There was discussion concerning the use of a Gas Chromatograph (GC) to analyze for contaminant specific determination during the soil gas program. (The proposed actions call for OVA testing for immediate results.) The use of a GC was not proposed because of contracting requirements, schedule delays, and cost. An OVA can be used to eliminate areas, but locations with elevated OVA readings would need subsequent testing. The Navy indicated that it plans to proceed with GC testing (if necessary) soon after the results of the soil gas program are reviewed.
- 7) The NYSDEC and BWD expressed their concerns with contractual delays. The Navy/HNUS indicated that there would not be any overall schedule delays because of the Plant No. 3 investigation.

#### Computer Modeling Efforts

- 1) Note that the EPA left the meeting during the computer modeling discussion (at approximately 3:15 PM). The time of this departure was known prior to the start of the meeting.
- 2) HNUS presented a brief discussion of the computer modeling efforts to date. In general the computer model is approximately 70% calibrated (meaning that 70% of the predicted water levels minus the measured water levels are within the stated criteria of +/- 2 feet).
- 3) NYSDEC requested information in actual drawdown values. HNUS indicated that this would be provided to NYSDEC.
- 4) NYSDEC was concerned about the usefulness of Pump Test No. 2 (using Production Wells) to estimate shallow aquifer parameters. HNUS indicated Pump Test No. 1 (using an intermediate depth well) was used to establish shallow and intermediate depth aquifer parameters. Pump Test No. 2 was used primarily for the deeper aquifer parameters.
- 5) HNUS also indicated that Pump Test No. 2 was only partially successful because of the lack of direct access to the production wells and the draw downs measured were much less than expected. HNUS suggested that Pump Test No. 3 (involving Hooker/RUCO) not be considered any further because of the problems with Pump Test No. 2. NYSDEC concurred.
- 6) NYSDEC commented that the general flow pattern (non pumping) should be more to the south-south west for the western part of the site and to the south south-east for the eastern part of the site. Geraghty & Miller (G&M) concurred.

- 7) BWD asked why the BWD wells to the south of Grumman were not included in the model (hydrologically). HNUS commented that these wells should not have much of an impact on the results because of their location. G&M commented that for future predictive runs that these wells should be included. The TRC in general agrees. HNUS indicated that the effect of these wells can be determined using a sensitivity analysis.
- 8) NYSDOH asked under what scenarios will the model be run. HNUS responds that there are two scenarios 1) current average conditions, and 2) worst reasonable case scenario. The BWD asked what the worst case. There was general discussion on the point with the conclusion being that additional work is required to establish the worst case scenario (see later discussion).
- 9) NYSDOH indicated that the report needs to state that the southern BWD wells are not being considered and state that a primary objective of the model is to evaluate flow conditions to the northeast BWD wells. (Note that the Navy intends to use well data from the southern BWD wells during the sensitivity analysis to evaluate the effects of these wells on the model).
- 10) NYSDOH asked about the models vertical and horizontal capacities. HNUS indicated that the model is three dimensional with vertical and horizontal flow components.
- 11) G&M and NYSDOH discuss confidence of deep results versus shallow results. G&M indicates that it is not a problem because of overwhelming effects of deep pumping overrides the deeper uncertainty.
- 12) BWD asked about historical conditions, former wells, rates, etc. Grumman indicated that historic wells were much shallower. HNUS and Grumman discuss historic versus present capacity. Grumman indicates that historic usage was much higher.
- 13) BWD asked about recharge patterns and quantities. Have they been constant or have they changed. Grumman indicated that patterns have not changed. Quantities are significantly lower now.
- 14) NYSDOH asked about computer results to date. HNUS stated that there are no results to date. Handouts are provided as examples only.
- 15) G&M commented that BWD wells are located close to the northern part of the boundary, which is designated as a constant head zone. This could result in underestimating the capture zone for these wells. (Note that the Navy plans to make adjustments to the northern constant-head boundary to compensate for proximity of these wells.)
- 16) NYSDEC asked how Hooker/RUCO factors into this model and briefly discusses pilot hole results and headspace. NYSDEC mentioned the possibility of DNAPL being present. HNUS indicated that the model can not address possible DNAPL from Hooker/RUCO transport to the Navy site. Also there was general discussion of installing an additional well between the Navy property and Hooker/RUCO.
- 17) BWD asked if Hooker/RUCO is going to participate in this investigation. NYSDEC indicated that all three parties will be involved in a fourth offsite ROD. There was some question as to who would lead this investigation. The BWD raised concerns about time tables.

#### Feasibility Study

- 1) The Navy discussed the Feasibility Study (distributed at the meeting) and requested that TRC members review for ARARs and objectives from their own "vested interest" points of view.

- 2) The Navy indicated that they may proceed with the Remedial Design prior to the ROD. The NYSDOH cautioned that part of the states acceptance is community input, which can not happen until the FS is complete. The Navy replied that it recognizes this risk.

#### **Community Relations Activities**

- 1) The Navy indicated that one Fact Sheet was distributed in February, which discussed the results of the temporary monitoring well program.

#### **General Comments and Open Discussion**

- 1) The BWD was requested to give a general overview of history/conditions of their wells. The BWD indicated the following. Plant 6 has no new results. Well 5-1 is clean. Plant 4 - low levels of organics (0.5 to 1 ppb) were beginning to appear fairly consistently over the last 6 to 9 months. Adams Street Plant has three wells, the shallow well was shut down years ago because of high nitrates and increasing organics. The deep wells are clean.
- 2) HNUS asked if we can get these results. BWD indicated yes, but that a formal letter request is needed.
- 3) The Navy indicated that the next TRC is tentatively scheduled for August 10, 1993.

## AGENDA

### **TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING #4 NWIRP BETHPAGE, NY March 10, 1993**

1. Introduction
2. Comments on Technical Review Committee (TRC) Meeting #3 Minutes
3. Navy/EPA - Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA)
4. Status Update of Phase 2 RI/FS
5. Phase 2 RI/FS Field Activities
  - Temporary Monitoring Wells Installation/Sampling (complete December 1992)
  - Soil/Sediment Sampling (complete December 1992)
  - Permanent Monitoring Wells Installation (complete February 1993)  
/Sampling (03/11-03/19/93)
  - Residue Sampling/Consolidation (?)
  - Plant No. 3 Soil Gas Program (March 1993)
6. Computer Modeling Efforts
  - Pump Tests (completed January 1993)
  - Calibration Runs
  - Run Scenarios
  - Feasibility Study Support (April 1993)
6. Feasibility Study
7. Community Relations Activities
  - Fact Sheet (February 1993)
8. General comments and open discussion

# ATTENDANCE LIST

NAME	ORGANIZATION	PHONE NUMBER
Jim Colter	NORTHERN DIVISION, NAUFAC	(215) 595-0567
TOM SHECKELS	" " "	" "
KEVIN C. KILMARTIN	HALLIBURTON NUS	215 971-0900
NANCY KUNTZLEMAN	NDIU, NAUFAC	(215) 595-0567
Mary Logan	EPA, Reg 2	(212) 264-5393
JOHN MOLLOY	BETHAMBE BARRON (112m)	(516) 756-8000 X60
Lloyd Wilson	NYS DOH	518-458-6305
TIM KICKERSON	NYS DOH	518-458-6305
Kelly Bologina	NYS DEC	018-457-9253
Peter C. Nimmer	Halliburton NUS	412-921-7105
Haurie Lutzker	Nassau County Dept of Health	516-535-3314
John Barnes	NYSDEC-DUWL	518-457-3395
HENRY WILKIE	NYSDEC-DHSR	518-457-7264
Jack Dunleavy	Northern Division NAUFAC	215-595-0567
Robert L. Wood	Industrial Systems Company	703-692-7637
David Brayack	Halliburton NUS	412-921-8375
Doug Smolensky	Geraghty & Miller	516 249-7600
CARLO SANGIOVANNI	"	516 391-5259
JOHN OHLMAN IV	GRUMMAN	516 575-2385
MARTIN SIMONSON	DPR	516 575-9952